

Remarks

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on February 8, 2005 and an Advisory Action mailed April 28, 2005. An earlier After-Final Amendment was filed on April 8, 2005. The Examiner indicated in the Advisory Action that the Amendment would not be entered because it raised new issues with respect to claim 44. Therefore, Applicants are submitting a new After-Final Amendment, which now cancels claims 40 and 44 in addition to the other changes made in the previous Amendment filed April 8, 2005.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating in the Final Office Action that claims 60-70 are allowed and claims 28, 30-33, 43, and 72-74 include allowable subject matter. Applicants have amended the independent claims to include subject matter from dependent claims that the Examiner indicated as being allowable.

Specifically, claims 26, 33, and 71 have been amended to include subject matter from claims 28, 43 and 72, which were indicated to be allowable. Claims 28, 40, 43, 44 and 72 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 26, 30-33, 35, 38-39, 41-42, 45-47, 60-71, 73-74 are pending. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Interview Summaries

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview of April 21, 2005. The Examiner initiated the call and stated that she had received the After Final Amendment and would be considering it. The Examiner's time and courtesy in providing this information is very much appreciated. No substantive matters were discussed and no agreement was reached.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for the brief telephone interview of May 4, 2005, initiated by Applicant's representative Kate DeVries Smith, who inquired whether it was possible for the Examiner to cancel claim 44 by Examiner's Amendment. The Examiner responded that it was not possible and that Applicant should submit an Amendment to that effect. The Examiner's time and courtesy in providing this information is very much appreciated. No substantive matters were discussed and no agreement was reached.

Rejections

Claim 44 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as not being enabled. This rejection is traversed, but is now moot because claim 44 has been cancelled.

Claim 26 was rejected as being anticipated by Pratt (US 1,221,587). This rejection is traversed. As discussed above, claim 26 was amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 28, therefore, claim 26 is allowable.


Claims 35 and 71 were rejected as being obvious over Pratt in view of Von Seidel (US 5,680,929). This rejection is traversed. Claim 35 depends from and further limits claim 26, which includes the allowable subject matter of claim 28, therefore, claim 35 is also allowable. Claim 71 was amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 72, therefore, claim 71 is allowable.

Claim 38-42 and 44-47 were rejected as being obvious over Von Seidel in view of Martell (US 5,242,064). This rejection is traversed. Claim 38 was amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 43, therefore, claim 38 is allowable. Claim 39, 41-42 and 45-47 depend on and further limit claim 38, which the Examiner has indicated includes allowable subject matter, therefore, claims 39, 41-42 and 45-47 are also allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: May 5, 2005


Katherine M. DeVries Smith
Reg. No. 42,157
KDS

